arXiv:1607.01997v2 [math.NA] 9 Jul 2016

On the semi-convergence of regularized HSS iteration methods for singular saddle point problems from the Stokes equations[☆]

Zhen Chao, Guoliang Chen[*]

Department of Mathematics, Shanghai Key Laboratory of Pure Mathematics and Mathematical Practice, East China Normal University, Dongchuan RD 500, Shanghai 200241, P. R. of China

Abstract

Recently, Bai and Benzi proposed a class of regularized Hermitian and skew-Hermitian splitting methods (RHSS) iteration methods for solving the nonsingular saddle point problem. In this paper, we apply this method to solve the singular saddle point problem from the Stokes equations. In the process of the semi-convergence analysis, we get that the RHSS method and the HSS method are unconditionally semi-convergent, which weaken the previous results. Then some spectral properties of the corresponding preconditioned matrix and a class of improved preconditioned matrix are analyzed. Finally, some numerical experiments on linear systems arising from the discretization of the Stokes equations are presented to illustrate the feasibility and effectiveness of this method and preconditioners.

Keywords: Singular saddle point problem, Regularized HSS method, Semi-convergence, Iterative, Stokes equation
2010 MSC: 65F08, 65F10, 65F35

1. Introduction

We consider the iterative solution of large sparse linear system:

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ B^* & O \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} p \\ q \end{pmatrix}, \tag{1.1}$$

where $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ is a hermitian positive definite matrix, $B \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times m}$ is a rank-deficient matrix, i.e., $rank(B) < m$. $p \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and $q \in \mathbb{C}^m$ are given vectors, with $n \geq m$ (possible

[☆]Supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 11471122), Zhejiang Provincial Natural Science Foundation of China (No. LY15A010016) and ECNU reward for Excellent Doctoral Students in Academics (No. xrzz2014020)

[*]Corresponding author.
Email addresses: zhenchao1120@163.com (Zhen Chao), glchen@math.ecnu.edu.cn (Guoliang Chen)

$n \gg m$), B^* denotes the conjugate transpose of B, and we assume that the linear system (1.1) is consistent. Under these conditions, the coefficient matrix of (1.1) is singular, then we call it a singular saddle point problem, which arises in many applications, such as the finite elements discretizations of partial differential equations. For example, the Stokes equations:

$$\begin{cases} -\triangle \mathbf{u} + \nabla p = \mathbf{f}, & in\ \Omega, \\ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = O, & in\ \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

this system is a model of viscous flow, the variable $\mathbf{u}$ is a vector-valued function representing the velocity of the fluid, and the scalar function p represents the pressure, more details can be found in [14]. We can use the IFISS [18] software to discretize (1.2) under some given conditions (see the numerical experiments for more details), then, the singular saddle point problem (1.1) can be obtained. There is a comprehensive survey about applications can be found in [7].

Since the coefficient matrix of (1.1) has some good properties when it is nonsingular (i.e., B is full rank), then in some cases [7, 19], in order to eliminate the singularity of the coefficient matrix of (1.1), some researchers try to drop some elements from matrix B or do other operation, such as in the field of electric networks, the rank deficiency in B can be removed by grounding one of the nodes. However, after this operation, the resulting linear systems maybe rather ill-conditioned, see [9] for details. In addition, Cao [11] has compared the convergence performance of Krylov subspace methods for solving singular saddle point problem (1.1) and the corresponding nonsingular saddle point problem by some numerical experiments, and found that the convergence behavior of the singular case is significantly better than of the corresponding nonsingular case, why it has such difference is still an open problem. Therefore, we may not directly transfer some singular cases into nonsingular cases.

In order to solve the large sparse singular saddle point problem (1.1), increasing attention has been drawn to the study of this linear system, and several authors have proposed some efficient iterative methods in recent years. Zheng et al. [27] applied the parameterized Uzawa method (or GSOR method) [5] to solve the linear system (1.1), they gave sufficient conditions for the semi-convergence of the parameterized Uzawa method, and determined the optimal iteration parameters and the corresponding optimal semi-convergence factor. And then several modified methods are proposed, see [12, 21, 23, 24] and references therein. When A is positive real, using the properties of the Moore-Penrose inverse, Zhang and Shen [25] gave a class of constraint preconditioners for solving singular saddle point problem, and Yang et al. [22] presented a general constraint preconditioning iteration method based on a singular constraint preconditioner. For general singular, non-Hermitian positive definite system (include the case (1.1)), Bai [1] derived necessary and sufficient conditions for the semi-convergence of the Hermitian and skew-Hermitian splitting (HSS) iteration methods, and investigate the semi-convergence factor and estimate its upper bound for the HSS iteration methods. Chao and Zhang [13] proposed

a class of generalized preconditioned HSS iteration method for solving singular linear system (1.1).

Recently, in order to solve nonsingular saddle point problem (i.e., B is full rank), Bai and Benzi [2] presented an efficient regularized Hermitian and skew-Hermitian splitting method (RHSS), then analyzed the convergence of this method and the spectral properties of the corresponding preconditioned matrix. This paper aims to use the RHSS method to solve the singular saddle point problems (1.1), and we prove that the RHSS method is unconditionally semi-convergent. In the process of analysis, we find that this analytical method can be also used to analyze the semi-convergence of HSS methods, and prove that HSS method is unconditionally semi-convergent for the general singular linear system, which has weaken the main results in [1]. Throughout the paper, I is an identity matrix of proper order, and O is a null matrix (or vector)of proper order.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we review the RHSS method and corresponding preconditioner and apply them to the singular saddle point problem (1.1). We prove that the RHSS method is unconditionally semi-convergent in section 3. In section 4, some spectral properties of the RHSS preconditioned matrix and a class of improved preconditioned matrix are given. Finally, some numerical experiments on singular saddle point problems arising from the discretization of the Stokes equations are presented to illustrate the feasibility and effectiveness of this method and preconditioners.

2. Review the RHSS iteration method

For solving the linear system (1.1), we can solve the equivalent linear system as the following:

$$\mathcal{A}\mathcal{X} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ -B^* & O \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} p \\ -q \end{pmatrix} \equiv \mathcal{F}. \tag{2.1}$$

Although the coefficient matrix $\mathcal{A}$ loses symmetry, it has some good properties as the nonsingular case can be found in [24, 25].

Let $P \in \mathbb{C}^{m\times m}$ be hermitian positive semi-definite matrix, as in [2], we can make the following matrix splitting for the coefficient matrix of the linear system (1.1).

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A} &= \begin{pmatrix} A & O \\ O & P \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} O & B \\ -B^* & -P \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{H}_+ + \mathcal{S}_-, \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} O & B \\ -B^* & P \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} B & O \\ O & -P \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{S}_+ + \mathcal{H}_-. \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

Then the RHSS iteration method [2] can be obtained as follows

$$\begin{cases} (\alpha I + \mathcal{H}_+)\mathcal{X}^{(k+\frac{1}{2})} = (\alpha I - \mathcal{S}_-)\mathcal{X}^{(k)} + \mathcal{F}, \\ (\alpha I + \mathcal{S}_+)\mathcal{X}^{(k+1)} = (\alpha I - \mathcal{H}_-)\mathcal{X}^{(k+1)} + \mathcal{F}, \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

where α is a positive iteration parameter. When $P = O$, the RHSS iteration method naturally reduces to the HSS method [3].

It is obvious that (2.3) can be equivalently written as

$$\mathcal{X}^{(k+1)} = \mathcal{T}(\alpha)\mathcal{X}^{(k)} + \mathcal{G}(\alpha)\mathcal{F}, \quad k = 0, 1, 2, ..., \tag{2.4}$$

where

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{T}(\alpha) = (\alpha I + \mathcal{S}_+)^{-1}(\alpha I - \mathcal{H}_-)(\alpha I + \mathcal{H}_+)^{-1}(\alpha I - \mathcal{S}_-), \\ \mathcal{G}(\alpha) = (\alpha I + \mathcal{S}_+)^{-1}(2\alpha + H_+ - H_-)(\alpha I + \mathcal{H}_+)^{-1}, \end{cases}$$

here, $\mathcal{T}(\alpha)$ is the iteration matrix of the RHSS method. The iteration scheme (2.4) may also come from the splitting

$$\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{M}(\alpha) - \mathcal{N}(\alpha),$$

with

$$\mathcal{M}(\alpha) = \mathcal{G}(\alpha)^{-1} = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\alpha}(\alpha I + A) & O \\ O & I \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} \alpha I & B \\ -B^* & \alpha I + P \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\mathcal{N}(\alpha) = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\alpha}(\alpha I - A) & O \\ O & I \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} \alpha I & -B \\ B^* & \alpha I + P \end{pmatrix},$$

then, $\mathcal{T}(\alpha) = \mathcal{M}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{N}(\alpha)$, the iteration scheme (2.4) is called stationary, and $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)$ can be treated as a preconditioner for singular linear system (1.1), which is called the RHSS preconditioner. When $P = O$, the corresponding preconditioner is HSS preconditioner, it is denoted by $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)$.

The actual implementation process of the RHSS method for the singular saddle point problem (1.1) is the same as the nonsingular case, we omit it here. From the iterative scheme of the RHSS method, we know that the regularization matrix P is mainly focus on preconditioning the off-diagonal blocks of (1.1), which is different from the PHSS method [4].

3. The semi-convergence of the RHSS method

In order to give semi-convergent analysis of the RHSS iteration method for solving singular saddle point problems (1.1). Firstly, we need to recall some basic concepts and results on the semi-convergence of the iteration methods for singular systems.

We use $\sigma(E)$ and $\rho(E)$ to denote the spectral set and the spectral radius of a matrix $E \in \mathbb{C}^{l\times l}$, respectively. For the stationary iteration scheme (2.4), it converges if and only if $\rho(\mathcal{T}(\alpha)) < 1$ when the coefficient matrix $\mathcal{A}$ is nonsingular. For the singular case, the iteration matrix $\mathcal{T}(\alpha)$ has the eigenvalue 1, in order to define the semi-convergence, we introduce the pseudo-spectral radius of $\mathcal{T}(\alpha)$, that is

$$\nu(\mathcal{T}(\alpha)) = \max\{|\lambda| : \lambda \in \sigma(\mathcal{T}(\alpha)), \lambda \neq 1\}.$$

The smallest nonnegative integer i such that $rank(E^i) = rank(E^{i+1})$ is called the index of E, and is denoted by $i = index(E)$. Obviously, $index(E) = 0$ while E is nonsingular, when E is singular, it has zero eigenvalue, i.e., $0 \in \sigma(E)$, then $index(E)$ is equal to the order of the largest Jordan block corresponding to the zero eigenvalue of E. In addition, $\mathcal{R}(E)$ and $\mathcal{N}(E)$ denote the range space and the null space of E, respectively.

Definition 3.1. [8] *For singular linear system* (2.1)*, let* $\mathcal{X}^{(0)}$ *be any initial guess, the iteration method* (2.4) *is semi-convergent if the iteration sequence* $\{\mathcal{X}^{(k)}\}$ *produced by* (2.4) *converges to a solution* $\mathcal{X}^{(*)}$ *of* (2.1)*, and it holds*

$$\mathcal{X}^{(*)} = (I - \mathcal{T}(\alpha))^D \mathcal{M}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{F} + [I - (I - \mathcal{T}(\alpha))^D (I - \mathcal{T}(\alpha))]\mathcal{X}^{(0)},$$

where $(I - \mathcal{T}(\alpha))^D$ *denotes the Drazin inverse* [26] *of* $I - \mathcal{T}(\alpha)$*.*

Then, one of necessary and sufficient conditions for the semi-convergence of (2.4) can be stated as follows:

Theorem 3.2. [8] *The iterative method* (2.4) *is semi-convergent if and only if* $index(I - \mathcal{T}(\alpha)) = 1$ *and* $\nu(\mathcal{T}(\alpha)) < 1$*.*

In order to analyze properties of the iteration matrix $\mathcal{T}(\alpha)$, we review some similar transformations as in paper [2], those operations are also can be applied to the singular saddle point problem (1.1).

By some operations, $\mathcal{T}(\alpha)$ is similar to

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}(\alpha) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha I & \widetilde{B} \\ -\widetilde{B}^* & \alpha I \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha I + A & O \\ O & \alpha I \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha I - A & O \\ O & \alpha I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha I & -\widetilde{B} \\ \widetilde{B}^* & \alpha I \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.1}$$

with $\widetilde{B} = \sqrt{\alpha} B(\alpha I + P)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, it is obvious that $\widetilde{B}$ is rank-deficient.

Let

$$\widetilde{M}(\alpha) = \frac{1}{2\alpha} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha I + A & O \\ O & \alpha I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha I & \widetilde{B} \\ -\widetilde{B}^* & \alpha I \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2\alpha}(\alpha I + \widetilde{\mathcal{H}})(\alpha I + \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}), \tag{3.2}$$

$$\widetilde{N}(\alpha) = \frac{1}{2\alpha} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha I - A & O \\ O & \alpha I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha I & -\widetilde{B} \\ \widetilde{B}^* & \alpha I \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2\alpha}(\alpha I - \widetilde{\mathcal{H}})(\alpha I - \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}),$$

where

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{H}} = \begin{pmatrix} A & O \\ O & O \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{\mathcal{S}} = \begin{pmatrix} O & \widetilde{B} \\ -\widetilde{B}^* & O \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then,

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}(\alpha) = \widetilde{M}(\alpha)^{-1}\widetilde{N}(\alpha) = (\alpha I + \widetilde{\mathcal{S}})^{-1}(\alpha I + \widetilde{\mathcal{H}})^{-1}(\alpha I - \widetilde{\mathcal{H}})(\alpha I - \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}), \tag{3.3}$$

from (3.1) and (3.2), we find that $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}(\alpha)$ is the iteration matrix of the HSS method for the singular saddle point problem with the following coefficient matrix

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{A}} = \begin{pmatrix} A & \widetilde{B} \\ -\widetilde{B}^* & O \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.4}$$

Based on the similarity of $\mathcal{T}(\alpha)$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}(\alpha)$, in the following, we only need to prove the HSS iteration method is semi-convergent for singular linear system with the coefficient matrix (3.4), that is, we should prove

$$index(I - \widetilde{\mathcal{T}}(\alpha)) = 1 \text{ and } \nu(\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}(\alpha)) < 1. \tag{3.5}$$

In field of real number, Zhang, Oyanagi and Sugihara [26] gave necessary and sufficient conditions for the convergence of Orthomin(k) for singular and inconsistent linear systems with the any given right hand side. Some results of this paper can be used to prove (3.5). In paper [13], we directly used those results, yet we find that they have a little difference since the linear system with the coefficient matrix (3.4) in the complex field. Therefore, we review and simply prove them as follows.

Let $C \in \mathbb{C}^{l\times l}$, and $rank(C) = r$, then QR decomposition of C can be written

$$C = QR\Pi,$$

where $Q \in \mathbb{C}^{l\times r}$ is a matrix with orthonormal columns, $R \in \mathbb{C}^{r\times l}$ is a upper triangular matrix and $\Pi \in \mathbb{C}^{l\times l}$ is a permutation matrix.

Let $W = QQ^*$, it is the projection matrix of C, then we can generalize some results of [26] to the complex number field, these properties as follows:

(1) $W^2 = W$,$W^* = W$;

(2) $WC = C$, $C^* = C^*W$;

(3) $\mathcal{N}(C) = \mathcal{N}(C^*)$ and $C = CW$ are equivalent.

The first two properties are obvious, the third property can be proved as the proof of the Lemma 4.1 in [26].

Theorem 3.3. *Let $C \in \mathbb{C}^{l\times l}$, if $\mathcal{H}(C) = \frac{1}{2}(C + C^*)$ is either positive or negative semi-definite, then $C = CW$.*

Proof. The proof is essentially analogous to those used in [26], yet it has some differences. Here, we give the main proof. We prove it by the method of reduction to absurdity, if $C \neq CW$, from the property (3), it has $\mathcal{N}(C) \neq \mathcal{N}(C^*)$, then there exists a vector $z \in \mathcal{N}(C^*)$ and $z \notin \mathcal{N}(C)$, which mean $C^*z = O$ and $Cz \neq O$. Let $z_t = Cz + tz$, t is a

real variable, then

$$\begin{aligned} z_t^*\mathcal{H}(C)z_t &= \frac{1}{2}(z_t^*Cz_t + z_t^*C^*z_t) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}((Cz+tz)^*C(Cz+tz) + (Cz+tz)^*C^*(Cz+tz)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(t^2(z^*Cz + z^*C^*z) + t(z^*C^*C^*z + 2z^*C^*Cz + z^*CCz) \\ &\quad + (z^*C^*C^*Cz + z^*C^*CCz)). \end{aligned}$$

Since $C^*z = O$ and $z^*C = O$, then it has

$$z_t^*\mathcal{H}(C)z_t = t(Cz)^*Cz + (Cz)^*\mathcal{H}(C)Cz.$$

Since $Cz \neq O$, let

$$\theta = \frac{(Cz)^*\mathcal{H}(C)Cz}{(Cz)^*Cz},$$

then, choose $t_1 > -\theta$ and $t_2 < -\theta$, we have

$$z_{t_1}^*\mathcal{H}(C)z_{t_1} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad z_{t_2}^*\mathcal{H}(C)z_{t_2} < 0,$$

which is contradictory that $\mathcal{H}(C) = \frac{1}{2}(C+C^*)$ is either positive or negative semi-definite. Then, it holds $C = CW$. □

The following lemma can be found in [10] (page 74).

Lemma 3.4. *Let $C \in \mathbb{C}^{l\times l}$, then the following statements are equivalent:*
(1) $\mathcal{N}(C) = \mathcal{N}(C^*)$;
(2) $\mathcal{R}(C) \overset{\perp}{\oplus} \mathcal{N}(C) = \mathbb{C}^n$;
(3) *There exists a unitary matrix U and nonsingular matrix $\widehat{C} \in \mathbb{C}^{r\times r}$, $r = rank\ (C)$, which satisfies*

$$C = U \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{C} & O \\ O & O \end{pmatrix} U^*.$$

Theorem 3.5. *Let $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ be a hermitian positive definite matrix, $P \in \mathbb{C}^{m\times m}$ be hermitian positive semi-definite matrix, $B \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times m}$ be of rank-deficient, and $\alpha > 0$ be arbitrary positive constant. Then, the RHSS iteration method unconditionally converges to the solution of the singular saddle point problem (1.1).*

Proof. From the above analysis, we need to prove (3.5). Since A is hermitian positive definite, it means $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}$ is positive definite, by Theorem 3.3 and property (3), we have

$\mathcal{N}(\widetilde{A}) = \mathcal{N}(\widetilde{A}^*)$. Then, from Lemma 3.4, there exist a unitary matrix $\mathcal{U}$ and nonsingular matrix $\widehat{\mathcal{A}} \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}$, $p = rank(\widetilde{\mathcal{A}})$ which satisfy

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{U}\begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\mathcal{A}} & O \\ O & O \end{pmatrix}\mathcal{U}^*.$$

Then,

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{H}} = \mathcal{U}\begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\mathcal{H}} & O \\ O & O \end{pmatrix}\mathcal{U}^* \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{\mathcal{S}} = \mathcal{U}\begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\mathcal{S}} & O \\ O & O \end{pmatrix}\mathcal{U}^*,$$

where

$$\widehat{\mathcal{H}} = \frac{\widehat{\mathcal{A}} + \widehat{\mathcal{A}}^*}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{\mathcal{S}} = \frac{\widehat{\mathcal{A}} - \widehat{\mathcal{A}}^*}{2}.$$

From (3.3), it holds

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}(\alpha) = \mathcal{U}\begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\mathcal{T}}(\alpha) & O \\ O & I \end{pmatrix}\mathcal{U}^*, \tag{3.6}$$

where

$$\widehat{\mathcal{T}}(\alpha) = (\alpha I + \widehat{\mathcal{S}})^{-1}(\alpha I + \widehat{\mathcal{H}})^{-1}(\alpha I - \widehat{\mathcal{H}})(\alpha I - \widehat{\mathcal{S}}).$$

Based on the expression of $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}(\alpha)$, obviously, it knows that $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}(\alpha)$ is the iteration matrix of the HSS method for the nonsingular linear system with the coefficient matrix $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$. From the Theorem 2.2 of the paper [3], it obtains $\rho(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}(\alpha)) < 1$ for any $\alpha > 0$, by (3.6), we immediately have $\nu(\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}(\alpha)) < 1$. Moreover, it has

$$I - \widetilde{\mathcal{T}}(\alpha) = \mathcal{U}\begin{pmatrix} I - \widehat{\mathcal{T}}(\alpha) & O \\ O & O \end{pmatrix}\mathcal{U}^*,$$

since $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ is nonsingular, then so is $I - \widehat{\mathcal{T}}(\alpha)$, it is easy to get $index(I - \widetilde{\mathcal{T}}(\alpha)) = 1$. Then, from Theorem 3.2, we obtain that the RHSS method with any positive α is semi-convergent for solving the singular saddle point problem (1.1). □

Based on the proof of the above theorem, we can give the following results on the semi-convergence of the HSS method for the general singular positive semi-definite linear system.

Corollary 3.6. *Let $E \in \mathbb{C}^{l\times l}$ be singular, non-Hermitian, and positive semi-definite matrix, x be the unknown vector, and $b \in \mathbb{C}^{l\times 1}$ be a given vector. Assume $b \in \mathcal{R}(E)$, then the HSS method for the singular linear system $Ex = b$ is unconditionally semi-convergent.*

Remark 3.7. *In* [1]*, for the singular, non-Hermitian, and positive semi-definite system $Ex = b$, the author gave the necessary and sufficient condition $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{H}(E)) \subseteq \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{S}(E))$ or $\mathcal{N}(E) \subseteq \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{H}(E))$ for guaranteeing the semi-convergence of the HSS iteration method,*

from Corollary 3.6*, we know that this condition is unnecessary, which means the HSS method is also unconditionally semi-convergent for the linear system* $Ex = b$*. In addition, let* $\gamma_{min}(E)$ *and* $\gamma_{max}(E)$ *be the minimum and the maximum nonzero eigenvalues of the matrix* $\mathcal{H}(E) = \frac{1}{2}(E + E^*)$*, respectively, then the quasi-optimum parameter of the HSS iteration method is* $\alpha_* = \sqrt{\gamma_{max}(E)\gamma_{min}(E)}$*. Therefore, for the linear system (1.1), from the similarity of* $\mathcal{T}(\alpha)$ *and* $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}(\alpha)$*, we can get the quasi-optimum parameter of the RHSS iteration method is* $\alpha_* = \sqrt{\gamma_{max}(A)\gamma_{min}(A)}$*, which is the same as the quasi-optimum parameter of the HSS iteration method. However, in actual implementations, we find that the quasi-optimum parameter is not very effective, thus, we choose the experimentally computed optimal ones that minimize the total number of iterations in our numerical experiments.*

4. Spectral properties of the preconditioned matrix

In this section, we consider two preconditioners for Krylov subspace methods applied to the singular saddle point problem (1.1). As is well known, for some cases, Krylov subspace methods, like GMRES [16], are all likely to suffer from slow convergence for large scale linear systems that arise from some typical applications. Preconditioning is a key ingredient for the useful of Krylov subspace methods in some applications. The efficiency of Krylov subspace methods is effected by the spectral distribution of the coefficient matrix and the degree of its polynomial. Preconditioning attempts to improve the spectral properties of the coefficient matrix $\mathcal{A}$ by transforming the linear system $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{F}$ into another system $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{M}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{F}$ with more favourable properties for iterative solution. By preconditioning, we expect that the preconditioned matrix will have a smaller spectral condition number or the preconditioned matrix has a minimum polynomial of small degree.

Now, we analyze spectral properties of the preconditioned matrix $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}$. Since $\mathcal{T}(\alpha)$ is similar to $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}(\alpha)$, and $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A} = I - \mathcal{T}(\alpha)$, $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\widetilde{\mathcal{A}} = I - \widetilde{\mathcal{T}}(\alpha)$, then, $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}$ have the same eigenvalues, i.e., $\sigma(\mathcal{M}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}) = \sigma(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\widetilde{\mathcal{A}})$. Therefore, we only need to analyze spectral properties of $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}$. Let λ be an eigenvalue of the preconditioned matrix $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}$, and $\widetilde{\mathcal{X}} = (\widetilde{x}^*, \widetilde{y}^*)^*$ be the corresponding eigenvector, i.e., $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}\widetilde{\mathcal{X}} = \lambda\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)\widetilde{\mathcal{X}}$. From (3.2) and (3.4), it has

$$\begin{cases} 2\alpha(A\widetilde{x} + \widetilde{B}\widetilde{y}) = \lambda(\alpha I + A)(\alpha\widetilde{x} + \widetilde{B}\widetilde{y}), \\ -2\alpha\widetilde{B}^*\widetilde{x} = \lambda(-\alpha\widetilde{B}^*\widetilde{x} + \alpha^2\widetilde{y}). \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose that* $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ *is a hermitian positive definite,* $P \in \mathbb{C}^{m\times m}$ *is hermitian positive semi-definite, and* $B \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times m}$ *is rank-deficient, then* $\widetilde{x} = O$*, if and only if* $\lambda = 0$*.*

Proof. If $\widetilde{x} = O$, then it follows from the second equality of (4.1) that $\alpha^2\lambda\widetilde{y} = O$, notice $\widetilde{y} \neq O$, otherwise, $\widetilde{\mathcal{X}} = (\widetilde{x}^*, \widetilde{y}^*)^* = O$, which contradicts the assumption that $\widetilde{\mathcal{X}}$ is an eigenvector, so $\lambda = 0$.

Conversely, if $\lambda = 0$, then (4.1) becomes

$$\begin{cases} A\widetilde{x} + \widetilde{B}\widetilde{y} = O, \\ \widetilde{B}^*\widetilde{x} = O, \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$

then, from the first equation of (4.2), we obtain $\widetilde{x} = A^{-1}\widetilde{B}\widetilde{y}$, then substituting it to the second equation of (4.2), it holds $\widetilde{B}^*A^{-1}\widetilde{B}\widetilde{y} = O$, which means $(\widetilde{B}\widetilde{y})^*A^{-1}\widetilde{B}\widetilde{y} = O$, Notice that A is hermitian positive definite, so is A^{-1}, then $\widetilde{B}\widetilde{y} = O$, and $A\widetilde{x} = O$, thus $\widetilde{x} = O$. □

Based on the Lemma 4.1, we consider the nonzero eigenvalue of $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}$ in the following. When $\lambda \neq 0$, i.e., $\widetilde{x} \neq O$, then the part of the analysis process is the same as [2], here, we obtain

$$(\alpha + \omega)\lambda^2 - 2[\alpha(1-\tau) + \omega]\lambda + 2\alpha(2-\tau) = 0, \tag{4.3}$$

where $\omega = u^*Au$, $\tau = u^*(\alpha^2 I + \widetilde{B}\widetilde{B}^*)^{-1}(\alpha^2 I - \widetilde{B}\widetilde{B}^*)u$, and $u = (\alpha^2 I + \widetilde{B}\widetilde{B}^*)\widetilde{x}$. The two roots of (4.3) are

$$\lambda_\pm = \frac{\alpha(1-\tau) + \omega \pm \sqrt{(\alpha(1-\tau)+\omega)^2 - 2\alpha(\alpha+\omega)(2-\tau)}}{\alpha + \omega}. \tag{4.4}$$

By taking limits of the eigenvalue λ, we have

$$\lim_{\alpha\to 0} \lambda_- = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\alpha\to 0} \lambda_+ = 2.$$

Based on the above analysis and Lemma 4.1, we can get the following results:

Theorem 4.2. *Let $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ be a hermitian positive definite matrix, $P \in \mathbb{C}^{m\times m}$ be hermitian positive semi-definite matrix, $B \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times m}$ be of rank-deficient, and $\alpha > 0$ be arbitrary positive constant. Then, the eigenvalues of the preconditioned matrix $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}$ tend to scatter near the point $[0, 0]$ or $(2, 0)$ as $\alpha \to 0$.*

Theorem 4.3. *Suppose that $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ is a hermitian positive definite, $P \in \mathbb{C}^{m\times m}$ is hermitian positive semi-definite, and $B \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times m}$ is rank-deficient. For any positive constants α, the real parts of the eigenvalue λ are all nonnegative, i.e., the preconditioned matrix $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}$ are positive semi-stable.*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{A}$ is singular, $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}$ has the eigenvalue 0, evidently, its real part is nonnegative. Next, we consider the nonzero eigenvalues of the preconditioned matrix $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}$. For convenience, we denote

$$L(\alpha) = (\alpha(1-\tau)+\omega)^2 - 2\alpha(\alpha+\omega)(2-\tau).$$

By some simple algebra operations, we obtain

$$L(\alpha) = (\omega-\alpha)^2 - \alpha^2(4-\tau^2).$$

From the definition of τ and ω, we know that $|\tau| \leq 1$ and $\omega > 0$, which means $3 \leq 4-\tau^2 \leq 4$. If $L(\alpha) \geq 0$, i.e., $0 < \alpha \leq \frac{\omega}{1+\sqrt{4-\tau^2}}$, then from (4.4), it holds

$$Re(\lambda_\pm) = \lambda_\pm \quad \text{and} \quad Re(\lambda_\pm) \geq 0,$$

where $Re(\bullet)$ denotes the real part of $(\bullet)$. If $L(\alpha) < 0$, i.e., $\alpha > \frac{\omega}{1+\sqrt{4-\tau^2}}$, the eigenvalue λ is complex, then from (4.4), it is easy to see

$$Re(\lambda_\pm) = \frac{\alpha(1-\tau)+\omega}{\alpha+\omega} > 0.$$

So, for any $\alpha > 0$, the real parts of the eigenvalue λ are all nonnegative. □

It is known that a real spectrum is a welcome property for the preconditioned matrix $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}$, because it can guarantee the efficient use of short-recurrence for Krylov subspace methods, such as Bi-CGSTAB [20] (page 139).

Corollary 4.4. *Let $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ be a hermitian positive definite matrix, $P \in \mathbb{C}^{m\times m}$ be hermitian positive semi-definite matrix, $B \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times m}$ be of rank-deficient. if $0 < \alpha \leq \frac{\omega}{1+\sqrt{4-\tau^2}}$, then all eigenvalues of the preconditioned matrix $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}$ are real.*

Next, in order to get a better approximation of the coefficient matrix $\mathcal{A}$, we propose an improved RHSS preconditioner (IRHSS preconditioner) as the following:

$$\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha) = \begin{pmatrix} A & B+\frac{1}{\alpha}AB \\ -B^* & \alpha I + P \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4.5}$$

Acturally, in order to analyze conveniently, we have eliminated the factor $\frac{1}{2}$ for $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)$, we also know that this factor has no effect on the preconditioned linear system, but it has impact on the eigenvalue distribution of the preconditioned matrix. Therefore, in order to compare with the spectrum distributions of other preconditioners, we add the factor $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)$ in our following numerical experiments, we still denote it by $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)$.

We can find that the difference between the preconditioner $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)$ and the coefficient matrix $\mathcal{A}$ is given by

$$\widehat{\mathcal{N}}(\alpha) = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha) - \mathcal{A} = \begin{pmatrix} O & \frac{1}{\alpha}AB \\ O & \alpha I + P \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4.6}$$

which is better approximation than the preconditioner $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)$. Now, we analyze the spectrum properties of the preconditioned matrix $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}$.

Theorem 4.5. *Let the preconditioner $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)$ be defined as in (4.5), then the preconditioned matrix $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}$ has the following properties:*
(1) *$\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}$ has an eigenvalue 1 with multiplicity at least n, and the corresponding eigenvalue vectors are of the format (e_i^*, O), where e_i, $i = 1, 2, ..., n$, are the linearly independent vectors in $\mathbb{C}^n$.*
(2) *The remaining eigenvalues of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}$ are given by μ_i, where μ_i, $i = 1, 2, ..., m$, are the eigenvalues of matrix $(\alpha I + P)^{-1}B^*\widehat{A}^{-1}B$ with $\widehat{A} = A + \frac{1}{\alpha}(\alpha I + A)B(\alpha I + P)^{-1}B^*$, and the corresponding eigenvalue vectors are of the format $(\frac{1}{\lambda - 1}\widehat{A}^{-1}B\upsilon^*, \upsilon^*)^*$, where υ is an eigenvector of $(\alpha I + P)^{-1}B^*\widehat{A}^{-1}B$.*

Proof. From (4.5), it has

$$\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha) = \begin{pmatrix} I & B + \frac{1}{\alpha}AB \\ O & \alpha I + P \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{A} & O \\ -(\alpha I + P)^{-1}B^* & I \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\widehat{A} = A + \frac{1}{\alpha}(\alpha I + A)B(\alpha I + P)^{-1}B^*$, and $\widehat{A}$ is nonsingular. Then, we can obtain

$$\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{A}^{-1} & -\widehat{A}^{-1}(B + \frac{1}{\alpha}AB)(\alpha I + P)^{-1} \\ (\alpha I + P)^{-1}B^*\widehat{A}^{-1} & (\alpha I + P)^{-1} - (\alpha I + P)^{-1}B^*\widehat{A}^{-1}(B + \frac{1}{\alpha}AB)(\alpha I + P)^{-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

From (4.6) and the above equation, it has

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A} &= I - \widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\widehat{\mathcal{N}}(\alpha) \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} I & O \\ O & I \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} O & -\widehat{A}^{-1}B \\ O & I - (\alpha I + P)^{-1}B^*\widehat{A}^{-1}B \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} I & \widehat{A}^{-1}B \\ O & (\alpha I + P)^{-1}B^*\widehat{A}^{-1}B \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we can assert that the preconditioned matrix $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}$ has n eigenvalues equal to 1 at least, and the other eigenvalues are equal to the ones of $(\alpha I + P)^{-1}B^*\widehat{A}^{-1}B$.

Now, we analyze the corresponding eigenvectors of them. Let $\widehat{\lambda}$ be an eigenvalue of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}$, $(\widehat{x}^*, \widehat{y}^*)^*$ be the corresponding eigenvector, where $\widehat{x} \in \mathbb{C}^n$, $\widehat{y} \in \mathbb{C}^m$, i.e.,

$$\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A} \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{x} \\ \widehat{y} \end{pmatrix} = \widehat{\lambda} \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{x} \\ \widehat{y} \end{pmatrix},$$

that is,

$$\begin{pmatrix} I & \widehat{A}^{-1}B \\ O & (\alpha I+P)^{-1}B^*\widehat{A}^{-1}B \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} \widehat{x} \\ \widehat{y} \end{pmatrix} = \widehat{\lambda}\begin{pmatrix} \widehat{x} \\ \widehat{y} \end{pmatrix},$$

then, it holds that

$$\begin{cases} \widehat{x}+\widehat{A}^{-1}B\widehat{y} = \widehat{\lambda}\widehat{x}, \\ (\alpha I+P)^{-1}B^*\widehat{A}^{-1}B\widehat{y} = \widehat{\lambda}\widehat{y}. \end{cases} \tag{4.7}$$

We can prove that $\widehat{y} = O$ if and only if $\widehat{\lambda} = 1$. If $\widehat{y} = O$, the first equation in (4.7) implies that $\widehat{\lambda} = 1$, otherwise, $\widehat{x} = O$, this contradicts with the fact that $(\widehat{x}^*, \widehat{y}^*)^*$ is an eigenvector. Conversely, if $\widehat{\lambda} = 1$, from the first equation of (4.7), it holds $\widehat{A}^{-1}B\widehat{y} = O$, substituting it into the second equation of (4.7), we get $\widehat{y} = O$. Thus, eigenvectors corresponding to eigenvalue 1 are of the form $(\widehat{x}^*, O^*)^*$, moreover, we can replace $\widehat{x}$ by e_i, $i = 1, 2, ..., n$, the coordinate vectors of $\mathbb{C}^n$.

When $\widehat{\lambda} \neq 1$, it means $\widehat{y} \neq O$, from (4.7), we have

$$\widehat{x} = \frac{1}{\widehat{\lambda}-1}\widehat{A}^{-1}B\widehat{y},$$

and $\widehat{y}$ satisfies the second equation of (4.7), this means that eigenvectors corresponding to nonunit eigenvalues are of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\widehat{\lambda}-1}\widehat{A}^{-1}B\widehat{y} \\ \widehat{y} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\widehat{y}$ is the eigenvector of matrix $(\alpha I+P)^{-1}B^*\widehat{A}^{-1}B$. □

For Krylov subspace methods, such as GMRES, from the proposition 2 in [17], we know that the solution $\mathcal{X}^{(k)}$ produced by GMRES at step k is exact if and only if the degree of the minimal polynomial of the initial residual vector $\mathcal{R}^{(0)} = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{F} - \widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{X}^{(0)}$ is equal to k. This means the GMRES method will terminate when the degree of the minimal polynomial is attained. Moreover, based on the proposition 6.2 in [16], the degree of the minimal polynomial of the initial residual vector is equal to the dimension of the corresponding Krylov subspace $\mathcal{K}(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{R}^{(0)})$. Therefore, we analyze the degree of the minimal polynomial of the initial residual vector $\mathcal{R}^{(0)}$.

Theorem 4.6. *Let the preconditioner $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)$ be defined as in (4.5), then the dimension of the Krylov subspace $\mathcal{K}(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{R}^{(0)})$ at most $m+1$. Moreover, assume $(\alpha I + P)^{-1}B^*\widehat{A}^{-1}B$ has $k(1 \leq k \leq m)$ distinct eigenvalues $\mu_i(1 \leq i \leq k)$ of respective multiplicity θ_i, where $\sum_{i=1}^{m}\theta_i = m$, the dimension of the Krylov subspace $\mathcal{K}(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{R}^{(0)})$is at most $k+1$.*

Proof. The proof is essentially analogous to that used in [15]. Based on the form of the preconditioned matrix $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}$ and the eigenvalue distribution described in Theorem 4.5, we know that the characteristic polynomial of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}$ is

$$(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}-I)^n\prod_{i=1}^{m}(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}-\mu_i I),$$

then expanding the polynomial $(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}-I)\prod_{i=1}^{m}(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}-\mu_i I)$, we obtain

$$(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}-I)\prod_{i=1}^{m}(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}-\mu_i I)=\begin{pmatrix} O & \widehat{A}^{-1}B\prod_{i=1}^{m}((\Gamma-\mu_i I) \\ O & (\Gamma-I)\prod_{i=1}^{m}((\Gamma-\mu_i I)\end{pmatrix}, \tag{4.8}$$

where $\Gamma=(\alpha I+P)^{-1}B^*\widehat{A}^{-1}B$.

Since the $\mu_i(i=1,2,...,m)$ are eigenvalues of Γ, it follows that

$$\prod_{i=1}^{m}((\Gamma-\mu_i I)=O.$$

Thus, the degree of the minimal polynomial of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}$ is at most $m+1$, which means the dimension of the corresponding Krylov subspace $\mathcal{K}(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A},\mathcal{R}^{(0)})$is at most $m+1$.

If the matrix Γ has k distinct eigenvalues μ_i of multiplicity θ_i, we can write the characteristic polynomial of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}$ as

$$(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}-I)^{n-1}\left[\prod_{i=1}^{m}(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}-\mu_i I)^{\theta_i-1}\right](\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}-I)\left[\prod_{i=1}^{m}(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}-\mu_i I)\right],$$

then expanding $(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}-I)\left[\prod_{i=1}^{m}(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}-\mu_i I)\right]$, we can get the same form as (4.8), therefore, the theorem can be proved completely. □

Remark 4.7. *Actually, for the (singular or nonsingular) saddle point problem (1.1), if the nonsingular preconditioner has the form as the following*

$$\mathcal{P}=\begin{pmatrix} A & Q_1 \\ -B^* & Q_2\end{pmatrix},$$

where $Q_2\in\mathbb{C}^{m\times m}$ is nonsingular matrix, $Q_1\in\mathbb{C}^{n\times m}$. Then, from the proof of Theorem 4.6, we know that the corresponding preconditioned matrix $\mathcal{P}^{-1}\mathcal{A}$ has the same properties as Theorem 4.6.

5. Numerical experiments

In this section, in order to show the effectiveness of the RHSS method and the proposed preconditioners, we present some numerical experiments to illustrate the performance of the RHSS iterative method with appropriate parameters and the GMRES method with the corresponding preconditioners $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)$, $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)$. Then, we compare them with the HSS iterative method and the GMRES method with HSS preconditioners. The numerical tests are performed by MATLAB R2012a (MathWorks, Natick, MA, USA) on the personal laptop with Intel(R) Core(TM) M-5Y71 CPU at 1.20 GHz and 8 G RAM. The stopping criterion is 10^{-6} for the relative residual norm:

$$RES = \frac{\|\mathcal{R}^{(k)}\|}{\|\mathcal{R}^{(0)}\|} \leq 10^{-8},$$

or the iteration number is exceeded 2000, where $\mathcal{R}^{(k)} = \mathcal{F} - \mathcal{A}\mathcal{X}^k$ is the residual at the kth iteration. And all experiments are started from the initial vector $\mathcal{X}^{(0)} = O$. In addition, based on the definition of the semi-convergence and the property of GMRES method, we know that the iteration solutions of HSS, RHSS and GMRES method for (1.1) is $\mathcal{X}^* = diag(I_{n\times n}, O_{m\times m})$. In the following tables, the number of iterations is denoted by IT, CPU represents the elapsed CPU time in seconds.

Example 5.1. *Consider the Stokes equations as (1.2), we use the IFISS software to discretize the leaky two-dimensional lid-driven cavity problem in a square domain* $(-1,1)\times(-1,1)$*, and take a finite element subdivision based on uniform grids of square elements. The unstabilized mixed finite element used is the bilinear-constant velocity-pressure:* $Q_1 - P_0$ *pair. A Dirichlet no-flow condition is applied on the side and bottom boundaries. The non-zero horizontal velocity on the lid is chosen to be* $\{y = 1; -1 \leq x \leq 1 | \mathbf{u}_x = 1\}$*, the stabilization parameter is* $\frac{1}{4}$*. By this package, we obtain the linear system form as (1.1).*

In order to give better performance, before solving the Example 5.1, we first scale the coefficient matrix $\mathcal{A}$ by the matrix $D = diag(diag(A), I)$, which results its nonzero diagonal entries are all equal to 1. In our implementations, we use the Cholesky factorization to solve the sub-systems with the coefficient matrices $\alpha I + A$, $\alpha I + \frac{1}{\alpha}B^*B$, $\alpha I + Q$, $\alpha I + Q + \frac{1}{\alpha}B^*B$ in both HSS method and RHSS method. And we choose the regularization matrix $Q = \delta B^*B$ to implement the RHSS iteration methods, where δ is a regularization parameter. In addition, we choose $Q = \delta diag(B^*B)$ for GMRES method while it use preconditioners $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)$.

In Figure 1, in order to give the experimentally computed optimal parameters and investigate the dependence of the HSS iterative method and the RHSS iterative method on the parameter α or δ, we plot the iterative steps of these two methods for different uniform grids with α from 0.01 to 1 or δ from 1 to 30. From the Figure 1, we find that for HSS method, the optimal parameter α decreases as n or m increases. And, for RHSS method, it has the same tendency.



(a) HSS method for different grids



(b) RHSS method for 16×16 grid



(c) RHSS method for 32×32 grid



(d) RHSS method for 64×64 grid

Figure 1: Number of iterations versus α and δ for Example 5.1 with different grids.



(a) The distributions of the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{A}$



(b) The distributions of the eigenvalues of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}$ with $\alpha = 0.01$



(c) The distributions of the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}$ with $\alpha = 0.01, \delta = 1000$



(d) The distributions of the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}$ with $\alpha = 0.001, \delta = 1000$



(e) The distributions of the eigenvalues of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha, \beta)^{-1}\mathcal{A}$ with $\alpha = 0.01, \delta = 1000$



(f) The distributions of the eigenvalues of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha, \beta)^{-1}\mathcal{A}$ with $\alpha = 0.001, \delta = 1000$

Figure 2: The distributions of the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{A}$, $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}$ with different parameters for Example 5.1 with 32×32 grid.

Table 1 IT, CPU and RES for Example 5.1

Grid		16×16	32×32	64×64
HSS	α_{opt}	0.090	0.051	0.028
	IT	528	751	1200
	CPU	0.179	1.304	22.094
	RES	9.960e-9	9.999e-9	9.960e-9
RHSS	α_{opt}	0.049	0.034	0.015
	δ_{opt}	30	30	10
	IT	432	655	1084
	CPU	0.136	1.012	16.648
	RES	9.956e-9	9.853e-9	9.877e-9

Table 2 Results for Example 5.1 as preconditiners with 16×16 grid.

	α	δ	IT	CPU	RES
GMRES			159	0.204	9.249e-9
HSS-GMRES	0.001		9	0.118	8.867e-9
	0.0001		4	0.066	7.713e-9
RHSS-GMRES	0.001	1000	6	0.058	5.496e-9
	0.0001	1000	3	0.057	1.700e-10
IRHSS-GMRES	0.0001	1000	1	0.032	4.320e-14

Table 3 Results for Example 5.1 as preconditiners with 32×32 grid.

	α	δ	IT	CPU	RES
GMRES			242	1.764	9.979e-9
HSS-GMRES	0.001		15	1.045	8.737e-9
	0.0001		7	0.593	1.442e-9
RHSS-GMRES	0.001	1000	6	0.458	4.885e-9
	0.0001	1000	3	0.301	9.677e-10
IRHSS-GMRES	0.0001	1000	1	0.139	2.375e-13

In Figure 2, we present the eigenvalue distribution of the original coefficient matrix $\mathcal{A}$ and three preconditioned matrices with different parameters α for 32×32 uniform grids. From these figures, for the same parameter α, we find that the eigenvalues of the RHSS preconditioned matrix $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}$ and the IRHSS preconditioned matrix $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}$ are much cluster than that of the HSS preconditioned matrix $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)^{-1}\mathcal{A}$. In addition, for

the same δ, the eigenvalues of RHSS and IRHSS preconditioned matrices are much more cluster as α decrease. These phenomenons confirm the above results.

Table 4 Results for Example 5.1 as preconditiners with 64×64 grid.

	α	δ	IT	CPU	RES
GMRES			369	9.804	9.622e-9
HSS-GMRES	0.001		27	8.34	8.035e-9
	0.0001		11	3.861	5.585e-9
RHSS-GMRES	0.001	1000	11	4.023	5.662e-9
	0.0001	1000	4	2.023	4.240e-9
IRHSS-GMRES	0.0001	1000	1	0.674	9.078e-14

In Table 1, we list performances of the HSS method and RHSS method for Example 5.1 with different size, they indicate that the RHSS method is better than the HSS method. In Table 2,3,4, we use the preconditioned GMRES method with different preconditioners to solve Example 5.1. Here, since the preconditioners $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)$ and $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha)$ are not very sensitive to δ, we choose the same $\delta = 1000$ in our numerical experiments. From these results, we find that RHSS-GMRES and IRHSS-GMRES are more better than HSS-GMRES method, and the iteration counts and CPU time decrease with the decreasing of α for both three preconditioned GMRES methods.

References

[1] Z.-Z. Bai, On semi-convergence of Hermitian and skew-Hermitian splitting methods for singular linear systems, Computing 89 (2010) 171-197.

[2] Z.-Z. Bai, M. Benzi, Regularized HSS Iteration Methods for Saddle-Point Linear Systems, Math/CS Technical Report TR-2016-001, http://www.mathcs.emory.edu/.

[3] Z.-Z. Bai, G.H. Golub and M.K. Ng, Hermitian and skew-Hermitian splitting methods for non-Hermitian positive definite linear systems, SIAM J. Matrix. Anal. Appl. 24 (2003) 603-626.

[4] Z.-Z. Bai, G.H. Golub and J.-Y. Pan, Preconditioned Hermitian and skew-Hermitian splitting methods for non-Hermitian positive semidefinite linear systems, Numer. Math. 98 (2004) 1-32.

[5] Z.-Z. Bai, B.N. Parlett, Z.-Q. Wang, On generalized successive overrelaxation methods for augmented linear systems, Numer. Math. 102 (2005) 1-38.

[6] M. Benzi, G.H. Golub, A preconditioner for generalized saddle point problems, SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl. 26 (2004) 20-41.

[7] M. Benzi, G.H. Golub, J. Liesen, Numerical solution of saddle point problems, Acta Numer. 14 (2005) 1-137.

[8] A. Berman, R. Plemmons, Nonnegative Matrices in Mathematical Science. Academic Press, New York, 1979.

[9] P. Bochev, R.B. Lehoucq, On the finite element solution of the pure Neumann problem, SIAM Rev. 2005, 47: 50-66.

[10] S.L. Campbell, C.D. Meyer, Generalized Inverses of Linear Transformations, Pitman, London, 1979.

[11] Z.-H. Cao, Comparison of performance of iterativemethodsfor singular and nonsingular saddle point linear systems arising from Navier-Stokes equations, Appl. Math. Comput. 174 (2006) 630-642.

[12] Z. Chao, G.-L. Chen, A generalized preconditioned parameterized inexact Uzawa method for singular saddle point problems, Appl. Comput. Math. 284 (2016) 219-225.

[13] Z. Chao, N.-M. Zhang, A generalized preconditioned HSS method for singular saddle point problems, Numer. Algor. 66 (2014) 203-221.

[14] H.C. Elman, D.J. Silvester, and A.J.Wathen, Finite elements and fast iterative solvers: With applications in incompressible fluid dynamics, in Numerical Mathematics and Scientific Computation, Oxford University Press, New York, 2005.

[15] C. Keller, N.I.M. Gould, and A.J. Wathen, Constraint preconditioning for indefinite linear systems, SIAM J. Matrix. Anal. Appl. 21 (2000) 1300-1317.

[16] Y. Saad, Iterative Methods for Sparse Linear Systems, Second Edition, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, 2003.

[17] Y. Saad, and M. H. Schultz, GMRES: A generalized minimal residual algorithm for solving nonsymmetric linear systems, SIAM J. Sci. Statist. Comput. 7 (1986) 856-869.

[18] D.J. Silvester, H.C. Elman, and A. Ramage, IFISS: Incompressible Flow Iterative Solution Software. http://www.manchester.ac.uk/ifiss

[19] V. Simoncini and M. Benzi, Spectral properities of the Hermitian and Skew-Hermitian splitting preconditioner for saddle point problems, SIAM J. Matrix. Anal. Appl. 26 (2004) 377-389.

[20] H.A. Van der Vorst, Iterative Krylov Methods for Large Linear Systems. Cambridge Monogr. Appl. Comput. Math. 13, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2003.

[21] A.-L. Yang, Y. Dou, Y.-J. Wu, X. Li, On generalized parameterized inexact Uzawa methods for singular saddle-point problems, Numer. Algor. 69 (2015) 579-593.

[22] A.-L. Yang, G.-F. Zhang, Y.-J. Wu, General constraint preconditioning iteration method for singular saddle-point problems, J. Comput. Appl. Math. 282 (2015) 157-166.

[23] G.-F. Zhang, S.-S. Wang, A generalization of parameterized inexact Uzawa method for singular saddle point problems, Appl. Comput. Math. 219 (2013) 4225-4231.

[24] N.-M. Zhang, T.-T. Lu, Y.-M. Wei, Semi-convergence analysis of Uzawa methods for singular saddle point problems, J. Comput. Appl. Math. 255 (2014) 334-345.

[25] N.-M. Zhang, P. Shen, Constraint preconditioners for solving singular saddle point problems, J. Comput. Appl. Math. 238 (2013) 116C125.

[26] S.-L. Zhang, Y. Oyanagi, M. Sugihara, M, Necessary and sufficient conditions for the convergence of Orthomin(k) on singular and inconsistent linear systems, Numer. Math. 87 (2000) 391-405.

[27] B. Zheng, Z.-Z. Bai, X. Yang, On semi-convergence of parameterized Uzawa methods for singular saddle point problems, Linear Algebra Appl. 431 (2009) 808-817.